

Educating for American Democracy: A Roadmap for Excellence in History and Civics Education for All Learners

Proposal for the “American History and Civics: National Convenings” grant supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs,
in partnership with the US Department of Education’s
American History and Civics Education – National Activities Program

Submitted by co-principal investigators

Louise Dubé, B.C.L./M.B.A., Executive Director, iCivics;
Danielle Allen, Ph.D., Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University;
Paul Carrese, Ph.D., School of Civic & Economic Thought and Leadership at Arizona State University;
Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg, Ph.D., Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) at Tufts University;
Peter Levine, Ph.D., Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life at Tufts University

Project Director: Kelly Leahy Whitney, Ed.D., iCivics

August 12, 2019

Abstract: For the last two decades, the American civics field has lacked a structure for bringing content and pedagogy experts into collaboration around the development of excellent curricular resources and guidance for the nation on civics and history education. The people and organizations assembled for this project have helped develop and disseminate a strong base of knowledge about *how* to understand and teach American history and civics. Collectively, we have produced innovative curricula and teaching materials, influenced state standards to incorporate effective pedagogies, published ground-breaking historical and political science research, and published education research on efficacy in civics education.

Teachers, curriculum-writers, textbook authors, and state and district officials must choose content and context carefully. Such choices should be informed by educational research, practitioners’ experience, and substantive expertise in state-of-the-art research on American history, political theory, and political science. Just as we would not let a STEM curriculum languish without incorporation of ground-breaking research in the sciences to balance fundamental principles and paradigms, so too should we not let a civics curriculum languish without incorporation of ground-breaking research in American civics. We propose to convene a transpartisan, interdisciplinary, cross-sector coalition of influential scholars and practitioners to develop a Roadmap to guide teachers and other stakeholders as they decide what to teach, to whom, and when.

Educating for American Democracy has three objectives: Discovery (evaluation of the current state of history and civics curricula and resources); Generation (creation of a Roadmap for excellence in history and civics education); and Dissemination (sharing and discussing the Roadmap, beginning at the National Forum in September of 2020). We expect a far-reaching impact achieved by harnessing each PI’s diverse and influential networks to increase public awareness of the report and use of the recommendations in districts and schools, especially those that serve low-income and rural students. The goal will be to establish a foundation from which to prepare all learners to understand the value of their American democracy as well as its past failures and present challenges, to give them a strong sense of connection to and ownership of that democracy, and to equip them with the knowledge, skills, and capacities that they need to sustain a healthy, thriving republic.

I. Intellectual Rationale and Overview of Program

A. NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE: *National Challenges: Partisanship, Polarization, and Equity*

Our republic is at a crossroads, facing deep partisan and philosophical polarization (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015); understanding of and trust in our democratic institutions are dangerously low (Foa & Mounk, 2015); and voter participation rates remain among the lowest among genuine democracies (Desilver, 2018). The relative neglect of civics education in the past half-century is a major root cause of much civic and political dysfunction (Levine & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017; Feith, 2011).

A recent study argues that the nation has downshifted from providing three courses in civics for every high school graduate in the mid-20th century, to one single-semester course in approximately forty states today (Rebell, 2018). Within four years after the implementation of No Child Left Behind, 33% of diverse school districts in a nationally representative sample reported reducing social studies instruction in order to devote more time to English and math (Rebell, 2018). In recent years, three-fourths of 18-year-old students don't pass the civics portion of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 2014). And while affluent students often have access to sites of civic development, others are left behind due to economic constraints or geographic inaccessibility (Atwell, Bridgeland, & Levine, 2017). Research consistently shows that low-income and underserved students need more innovative and student-centered educational approaches to develop the civic knowledge, skills and dispositions to be informed and capable citizens of America's constitutional Republic (Levine & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017; Levinson, 2012).

This recent decline in civics education is more than just a root cause of our dysfunction, but a symptom too. When the National Governors' Association developed the Common Core State Standards, they originally intended to establish standards in English language arts, STEM, and social studies. The social studies project failed because polarized debates over our history—whether to emphasize the “gory” or the “glory”—made consensus about the standards unachievable. In an era of high stakes accountability, where class time allocations are driven by testing regimes, social studies—commonly home to much civics content—went untested, and therefore faced reduced investments of time and other resources.

Relatedly, intellectual shifts among professional historians have resulted in important scholarship, particularly on historically-marginalized American populations. But they have also left the discipline of history, as practiced in colleges and universities, less ready to support the creation of the kinds of overarching narratives needed in K-12 curricula (Lepore, 2019). Similarly, in political science, research agendas and methods expanded dramatically from the 1980s to the present, as American political thought was reconsidered, as political scientists introduced the study of social movements alongside institutions, as survey research widened its lens to include youth political opinion, and as political and legal scholars sought to assimilate the administrative state to core understandings of our political institutions. But university-level subject-expert researchers had few incentives to contribute to K-12 curricula, partly because political science shifted away from both the foundational study of the Constitution as well as the ideals that its complex forms seek to protect. As a result, little of the new research has informed or strengthened civics curricula.

Effectively, K-12 history and civics courses were pushed out of the limelight due to struggles of interpreting our history. They have inadequately been infused with new knowledge that would make curricula and teaching relevant to all learners. Out of the limelight, history and civics courses were also less likely than STEM courses to be supported by investment in innovative instructional strategies—for instance project-based learning—which have been shown to be more effective for the full diversity of learners (Boss et al., 2011). *Educating for American Democracy* seeks to remedy this situation. The time is right.

Leading historians, including Steering Committee member Jane Kamensky and Task Force members Erica Dunbar, Lincoln Mullins, Allen Guelzo, and Jim Grossman will work to rebuild the discipline’s capacity to support K-12 education with refashioned narratives, weaving together central ideas and actors of the American story with those who have lived at the margins. Political scientists, such as Steering Committee and Task Force members Cathy Cohen, Paul Carrese, David Leal, Rogers Smith, and Jim Stoner will re-integrate knowledge of our founding ideals and Constitution with contemporary concerns, emphasizing the great debates that produced America’s principles and institutions—and how those debates percolate across our centuries, calling informed citizens to engage them anew. The broad range of scholars and practitioners in our *Educating for American Democracy* team have worked with educators from Florida, Massachusetts, Arizona,

California, and Illinois. They are fusing innovative approaches to content with new instructional strategies. These educators are creating curricula and learning opportunities that inspire, motivate, and scaffold deep learning and preparation for civic life for all learners.

Importantly, many of the members of the proposed team have been working collaboratively in the [CivXNow](#) Coalition. Founded in 2018 by iCivics—the largest civics education provider in the country—this coalition of [109 organizational members](#) has been leading a nationwide call for civics reform: a systematic effort to re-imagine high-quality civics education in schools, at scale. CivXNow has published a white paper [The Republic is \(Still\) at Risk](#) (Levine & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017) focused on the current state of civics education, and which updates the [Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools](#) report (Gould, J. et al, 2011). The coalition has conducted a nationwide survey about the root causes of our poor K-12 civics education system, collecting over 7,200 responses, from which it designed and published an empirical [system map](#) of necessary solutions for improved civic learning. These include (1) promoting public awareness of the importance of civics education; (2) advancing the understanding of best practices in K-12 civics education; and (3) advancing state policy. The CivXNow coalition and partners have deep expertise with convening and disseminating information to the field, putting this proposal at a strategic advantage.

With iCivics' proven leadership—coupled with the research done by iCivics, CIRCLE, the Democratic Knowledge Project at Harvard, and the School of Civic & Economic Thought and Leadership at ASU; and the distinguished educators and scholars as collaborators—this partnership presents a rare effort to integrate history and political science research, and to connect this content expertise to practitioners innovating with instructional strategies. We will create a Roadmap for states, districts, schools, and educators to restore a path toward excellence in American history and civics education for all learners. We will use the structure of a Steering Committee, domain-specific Task Forces in History, Political Science, and Pedagogy, and a pool of Expert Advisors to complete our three objectives: Discovery, Generation, and Dissemination.

As a young nation, the United States led the establishment of public schooling to create an informed and educated citizenry—a vision of the founders (O'Connor, 2011). High-quality history and civics education for American citizens and community members does two critical things: (1) it fosters civic knowledge,

particularly of America’s rich legacy of self-government under our Constitution, including continuing debates about its principles, our failures in respect to them, and how to perfect the constitutional order (Campbell, 2019); (2) it cultivates civic dispositions and skills through the mastery of one’s voice, democratic coordination, and shared political institutions—all of which contribute to well-functioning democratic decision-making within our constitutional order (Campbell, Levinson, & Hess, 2012).

Today, ours is the world’s oldest democracy (Hauer, 2016). The future of the Republic still depends on civics education. Young people require accounts of the shape of our political ideals, institutions, and their operations that are true to the present, as well as to the past. Students must be equipped with real skills for taking ownership of our civic world as it is presently constituted. True American histories must reckon with the pervasive evil of chattel slavery, confront the violent dispossession of the continent’s indigenous people, examine the way the nation has drawn its borders—often in ways designed to exclude—and sometimes through violent means. But though a civically-useful American history must confront these bitter truths among others, it cannot rest there. It also must teach the genius of the nation’s founding documents, most especially their capacity to inspire future generations—including our own—to use their powers, ideals, and concepts to better embody their promises. A useful American history program must mine the past to discover lessons for the present and the future: lessons in rhetoric and action, in persistence and compromise, in solidarity and civil disagreement, in rights and the organization of power. It must take as its goal not only the conveying of information, but the very task of the Constitution itself: *to build a more perfect Union*. By contextualizing civic knowledge and skills with historical thinking, and by teaching civics through the arc of American history, evidence suggests that civic dispositions and civic engagement will be strengthened (Levine & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017). *Educating for American Democracy* will produce a Roadmap toward an education in American history and civics of this kind.

B. OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM: “*Educating for American Democracy*”: *Reimagining the Potential Impact of American History & Civics*

Our overarching objective is the creation of a Roadmap for excellence in history and civics education. The landscape of American history and civics education is a patchwork of 50 state standards (also

DC Public Schools and the U.S. territories) that often list facts and episodes of our history that are not considered, nor synthesized through a civic lens. Such standards fail educators as they are left to extract the meaning of these events and their connection to preparing learners for informed civic participation. We know the process is failing because the national testing program, the “Nation’s Report Card”, found that only 18% of American students are proficient in history, and only 23% in civics (NAEP, 2014). The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) College, Career, and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies State Standards (C3) attempted to address this problem. The C3 was written as a general framework for authors of state standards who were expected to add content. On its own, it is not easily implementable by teachers. While many states have referred to C3, few have adopted it fully (Levine & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017).

This deficit in guidance regarding civic and historical content, pedagogy, and implementation is what *Educating for American Democracy* seeks to map and fill. These three pieces are distinct and necessary, but also must be synthesized in a comprehensive educational Roadmap. With support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the U.S. Department of Education, we will outline concretely—by grade level—high-priority content areas that bridge history and civics; high-priority instructional practices; and high-priority design principles for the development and implementation of history and civics curricula. We will articulate the content, pedagogy, and implementation guidance in a teacher/school-facing framework and in a district/state-facing framework. As we identify a high priority content area—e.g., Supreme Court cases and the evolution of rights— we will direct teachers to texts, curricula, and resources, while directing districts and states toward ways to support curriculum design, implementation, and teacher professional development.

Content: History and civics education is not one-size-fits-all. State educational systems and districts need the opportunity to design curricula that suit their contexts while also adhering to standards of excellence shared across states and districts. Rather than providing guidance that consists of a list of texts or dates, *Educating for American Democracy* will identify high-priority thematic areas by grade-level; high-priority instructional strategies by grade-level; design principles for excellence in designing a curricular unit around those themes; and provide examples of text resources, curricular resources, and curriculum modules that meet those standards. For instance, we might recommend “expanding liberty and suffrage” as a high-priority theme that

should loop through the K-12 developmental sequence, appearing in 5th grade, 8th grade and high school. The theme would integrate history and civics knowledge, past victories with ongoing struggles, with different instructional strategies at different grade levels. In 8th grade, this theme of rights expansion across the 19th and the 20th centuries might be re-labeled “Justice in Action” as instructional strategies begin to pivot toward supporting the development of learners’ capacity for civic action.

Recently, states have sought to incorporate news literacy in their state social studies standards. This dimension of civics education is critically important to the preparation of students for an increasingly digital democracy. Some of the partners on this project are already leading the integration of news literacy into civics education (Bouyges, 2018). The *Educating for American Democracy* team will offer guidance to educators about pedagogical approaches demonstrated to build effective news literacy skills. In addition, the Roadmap will highlight where and how news literacy content should be embedded in the curriculum sequence to ensure student understanding of the role of media and influence in the development of our nation.

Pedagogy: *Educating for American Democracy* will also provide guidance on high-priority instructional strategies.

Our team is a network of leaders in education who have been experimenting with innovative pedagogical methods, including project- and inquiry-based learning; document and primary source pedagogies; active-learning (e.g., simulations & video-games driven by student choice); and lived democracy pedagogies (e.g. democracy schools where real decision-making is connected to student learning). The gold standard for innovative pedagogy is to scaffold disciplinary mastery and build civic capacities, dispositions, and engagement simultaneously. Our Roadmap will offer evidence-based guidance on grade-level instructional strategies to achieve this for all learners. We will also present guidance on accommodations for English Language Learners and special needs students, and extensions for learners ready for additional challenges.

Curriculum Development and Implementation: Finally, *Educating for American Democracy* will provide guidance on high-priority design principles for curriculum development and implementation. The testing regimes that flowed from No Child Left Behind and the Common Core often made test designers de facto drivers of curriculum design. The standards themselves left open the question of which, among a diversity of possible texts, a school might emphasize; or of how to balance among the many different issues the standards

called upon schools to achieve. Yet test designers answered these questions implicitly as they chose what to include or leave out on tests (Conley, 2014). This resulted in teachers learning to “teach to the test”; tests became, in many cases, the curricular framework driving learning. This has engendered atrophy of capacity in schools and districts for curriculum building. The time has come for schools and districts to rebuild their capacity for curriculum design and for a policy model in which states expect that standards adoption will be followed by a period of curriculum development tightly linked to content experts. We need curriculum designers, not test designers, to determine how standards will be converted to curricula. Such a model requires that states and districts have a capacity for curriculum design. This typically requires investment in a social studies coordinator, or regional collaboration, as well as a co-design process that links classroom teachers, whom are experts in grade-appropriate pedagogy to content experts. To ensure this process is followed in our design, all of our recommendations will take shape through partnerships with educators, and we will be particularly intentional in ensuring that guidance is focused on both the needs as well as the input of teachers of urban, rural, and underserved students.

II. Design, Content, and Implementation

Educating for American Democracy will achieve this Roadmap by means of a process of fact-finding (October, 2019 - February 2020); recommendation generation (February - March 2020); and a period of report development (March - August 2020) and dissemination (September 2020 and following). We will use a structure of a Steering Committee, domain-specific Task Forces in History, Political Science, and Pedagogy, and a pool of Expert Advisors to complete our three objectives of Discovery (evaluation of the current state of history and civics curricula and resources); Generation (creation of a Roadmap for excellence in history and civics education); and Dissemination. The Steering Committee will guide the overall shape of the work. The Task Forces will be responsible for the fact-finding work and evaluation of gaps between what exists and what we propose to recommend. In particular, the Content Task Forces on History and Political Science/Civics will map out and evaluate: (1) the landscape of existing state standards in history, social studies, political science and civics; (2) curricular offerings and instructional strategies in history, social studies, and civics; (3) new research that ought to be integrated into the curriculum; and (4) research findings

on understanding and measuring excellence in history and civics education. The cross-discipline Pedagogy Task Force will assess the state of research to practice connections in social studies; synthesize extant research on efficacy of various pedagogical approaches; and identify key practitioner questions that need to be addressed through research.

The existing landscape will be evaluated from two perspectives: what is needed to succeed in growing understanding of the value of American's constitutional democracy, including its history, challenges, and potentialities; and what is needed to cultivate mastery of how to use one's voice, skills of democratic coordination, and shared political institutions to contribute to well-functioning democratic decision-making in our complex, constitutional Republic. Complete literature reviews will be commissioned as part of the Task Force work. Upon commencement of the grant, all Task Forces will meet virtually, bi-weekly, to review and discuss goals and findings. The pool of Expert Advisors will be tapped as sources in that fact-finding work. The Steering Committee, in collaborative convenings with federal agency representatives in February and March 2020, will analyze and synthesize the results of the fact-finding to generate the recommendations that will form the content of the Roadmap.

Importantly, we will not be starting from scratch. The breadth and depth of expertise embodied in the appended Letters of Support provide testimony to our collective experience in these fields of history and civics education. The partnering institutions, represented by the Principal Investigators, as well as the members of the Steering Committee, collectively possess a panoramic view of the current experimentation in history and civics education around the country. We will surface and collate what we know; use our Task Forces to pursue answers to what we don't know; and systematically assess the state of curricular resources currently available. This process—with over 100 experts, including leading academics and pedagogy experts—will lead to clear and actionable recommendations compiled in a report. Peter Levine from Tufts University and Danielle Allen from Harvard University will co-author the report in coordination with the other co-PIs.

Educating for American Democracy will use iCivics' educator community and other partner communities for field testing to ensure that the Roadmap is a practical and useful document in the classroom. We will field at least one focus group of educators at each of the participating P.I. institutions (May 2020). iCivics will

organize subsequent diverse focus groups to review recommendations and incorporate feedback (July 2020). These tactics will ensure accountability to the field of practice as well as produce solutions that can be immediately adopted by volunteering schools and institutions.

The Dissemination Phase would include a high-visibility event at the National Forum in Washington D.C, in September 2020, co-hosted with the *Educating for American Democracy* team by the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History and the National Archives and Records Administration Foundation. The Forum itself would focus on sharing the findings from the first two convenings, and reviewing report recommendations. *Educating for American Democracy* will leverage the National Forum into a robust national marketing and visibility campaign. iCivics will oversee all tasks related to the Roadmap's composition, design, copy-editing, publication, and distribution. Most importantly, iCivics will coordinate and leverage networks of all project partners to ensure extensive distribution to school districts across the nation.

Via the CivXNow Coalition, iCivics is well-placed to activate a powerful network of members. iCivics will disseminate the results of this work both to state and district policy makers/leaders, as well as directly to educators. We will publish all reports in print format as well as digitally on the CivXNow site, then develop and implement communications channels for the Coalition members, with clear calls to action. As it stands currently, the CivXNow Coalition has a combined social media reach to over 6.8 million people. iCivics will disseminate the Roadmap to its vast community of impassioned civics teachers (100,000+ annually). In addition, *Educating for American Democracy* will secure dissemination partners. The National Archives and Records Administration Foundation, for instance, will use its existing national network of civics and history educators to assist in the distribution of the physical report as well as promote it electronically. The Foundation's efforts to disseminate the report will include the education departments for the 14 non-profit presidential library foundations in 11 states and more than 200 teachers attending civics teacher training institutes at multiple sites in Florida, Texas, and West Virginia. Additionally, the Steering Committee will secure commitments from the Task Force institutions, and the pool of experts to take at least one action step to support the dissemination of the Roadmap. iCivics will activate additional dissemination partners from its large network, such as the National History Coalition, the National Coalition of History Education, and the

Civics Renewal Network among others. Beyond those channels, iCivics will activate the other partnering organizations in this proposal that have built national networks of teacher-leaders and communities for educators. Following the National Forum in Washington D.C., CivXNow/iCivics will organize additional targeted outreach to a range of stakeholders including school administrators and their representatives, higher education institutions, community colleges, thought leaders, civic & after-school learning providers, service & student organizations, research bodies, and the media.

III. Project Faculty and Staff

Principal Investigators - will serve as the collaborative leadership of the program, in both an intellectual and executive capacity. All five P.I.s are visionaries and leaders in their respective areas of the field.

- **Danielle Allen**, Ph.D., James Bryant Conant University Professor; Director, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University.
- **Paul Carrese**, Ph.D., Director of the School of Civic & Economic Thought and Leadership at ASU.
- **Louise Dubé**, B.C.L./M.B.A., Executive Director, iCivics.
- **Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg**, Ph.D., Director, CIRCLE at Tufts University.
- **Peter Levine**, Ph.D., Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University.

Project Staff

- **Kelly Leahy Whitney**, Ed.D., Chief Product and Partnerships Officer, iCivics. Dr. Leahy Whitney will serve as Project Director, overseeing the administrative components of the grant and the execution of the project. She previously served as Project Director for an NEH Digital Humanities grant (2018-19).
- **Matt Osber**, Technology Director, iCivics. Mr. Osber will lead on development of the project's website, and troubleshoot any related issues. He has spent his career developing educational technology.
- **Patricia Leslie-Brown**, Project Manager, iCivics. Ms. Leslie-Brown will coordinate the convenings and the Roadmap publication. She will also lend support to the various Committees, as needed.

Applying Institution: iCivics

iCivics is a civics non-profit that was founded in 2009 by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. [iCivics](#) makes civics education relevant to new generations of Americans through [online games](#) and [innovative](#)

[resources](#)—digitally and for free (Singer, 2016). iCivics is the largest-scaled civics education provider in the nation, serving each year over 100,000 teachers and 6 million students across all 50 states. iCivics’ mission is one of equity: all students must benefit from an excellent civics education, regardless of their geography or family income. The organization is a leader in civics education and educational technology—innovating and driving the fields forward. It is staffed and supported by educators, technology experts, and a high-caliber board of advisors. iCivics’ unique curriculum design is supported by [independent research](#): increasing students’ civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions—even when controlling for gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status. Even in these polarized times, an astonishing 95% of teachers view iCivics as a “trusted and non-partisan resource that fosters civil conversations about current events in their classrooms.”

iCivics has frequently worked as a convener, organizing large, high-visibility, and national impact-focused convenings including those for CivXNow. Recent examples include the [Civic Learning Impact and Measurement Convening](#) (Menlo Park CA, January 2019), [Democracy at a Crossroads Summit](#) (Washington D.C., September 2017), the Medal of Freedom Ceremony (the Supreme Court, Washington D.C., November, 2015). These events have focused on raising visibility for civics education, and have included a broad mix of teachers and students, members of academia, political leaders and policy-makers, funders, and national media.

Supporting Institutions

- **Louisiana State University**, Eric Voegelin Institute (supported by its sister HBCU institution, Southern University), Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Site of the first convening, by February 14, 2020.
- **Arizona State University**, School of Civic & Economic Thought and Leadership, Phoenix, Arizona. Site of the second convening, by March 31, 2020.
- **Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of American History and The National Archives and Records Administration Foundation**, Washington, D.C. Co-hosts of the National Forum and dinner for speakers and guests, September 2020.

Steering Committee Composition

	Member Name	Affiliation
1	Danielle Allen	Director Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University
2	Louise Dubé	Executive Director iCivics

3	Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg	Director CIRCLE, Tufts University
4	Paul Carrese	Director School of Civic & Economic Thought & Leadership, ASU
5	Peter Levine	Associate Dean Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University
6	Sarah Drake Brown	Director National Council for History Education
7	Jane Kamensky	Professor of History Harvard University
8	Lee White	Executive Director National Coalition for History
9	Tom Gentzel	Executive Director National School Boards Association
10	David Bobb	President Bill of Rights Institute
11	Allen Pratt	Executive Director National Rural Education Association
12	Jeremy Gypton	Teacher Programs Manager Ashbrook Center
13	Ace Parsi	Director of Innovation National Center for Learning Disabilities
14	Prisca Rodriguez	ESL/ELA Teacher & ELL Department Chair D.C. Public Schools
15	Tim Bailey	Director of Education Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History
16	Jarvis Givens	Assistant Professor Harvard Graduate School of Education
17	Michelle Herczog	History-Social Science Coordinator, LA County Office of Education; President of California Council for the Social Studies
18	Averill Kelley	Teacher U.S. Govt. & History West Prep. Academy, North Las Vegas
19	Adrienne Stang	K-12 History and Social Studies Coordinator Cambridge Public Schools
20	Mary Ellen Daneels	Lead Teacher Mentor McCormick Foundation
21	Tammy Waller	Director of K-12 Social Studies & World Languages AZ Dept of Ed.
22	Laura Tavares	Associate Program Director Facing History and Ourselves
23	Donna Phillips	Director, Curriculum & Assessment Innovations D.C. Public Schools
24	Natacha Scott	Director of History and Social Studies Boston Public Schools
25	Alhassan Susso	Founder & Director International Community High School
26	Carrie Kotcho	Director of Education & Impact Natl. Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution
27	Rogers Smith	President American Political Science Association
28	Jim Grossman	Executive Director American Historical Association
29	Maria Marable Bunch	Assoc. Director of Museum Learning & Programs Smithsonian
30	TBD	Expert in Indigenous Studies

Task Forces Composition

	Member Name	Affiliation
American History Content Task Force		
1	Jane Kamensky, <i>Co-chair</i>	Professor of History Harvard University
2	Ben Schmidt	Director, Digital Humanities New York University (<i>pending</i>)
3	Erica Dunbar	Professor of History, Rutgers University
4	Donald Critchlow	Professor & Director, Political History and Leadership ASU
5	Allen Guelzo	Director, Civil War Era Studies Gettysburg College; as of Sept 2019 Humanities Council & James Madison Program in American Ideals & Institutions, Princeton University
6	Lincoln Mullen	Assistant Professor of History George Mason University
7	Madeline Hsu	Professor of History University of Texas, Austin
8	Tammy Waller	Director, K-12 Social Studies & World Languages AZ Dept. of Ed.
9	George Sanchez	Director, Center for Democracy & Diversity USC
10	Adrienne Stang	K-12 History & Social Studies Coord. Cambridge Public Schools
11	Melinda Maynor Lowery	Director, Ctr for Study of the American South UNC-Chapel Hill (<i>pending</i>)
12	TBD	News Literacy Education Representative

Political Theory and Civics Content Task Force		
1	Danielle Allen	Director Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University
2	Michelle Herczog, <i>Co-chair</i>	History-Social Science Coordinator, LA County Office of Education; President of California Council for the Social Studies
3	Adam Seagrave, <i>Co-chair</i>	Assoc. Director School of Civic & Economic Thought & Leadership, ASU
4	David Bobb	President Bill of Rights Institute
5	Peter Levine	Associate Dean Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University
6	Joseph Kahne	Director Civic Engagement Research Group, UC Riverside
7	Marshall Croddy	President Constitutional Rights Foundation
8	James Stoner	Director Eric Voegelin Institute for American Renaissance Studies, LSU
9	Rogers Smith	President American Political Science Association
10	David Leal	Professor, Latino Politics University of Texas, Austin
11	Frank Pisi	Director, History-Social Science Sacramento County Office of Education
12	Sharif El-Mekki	Principal Mastery Charter School
13	Aisha Vasquez-Johnson	Elementary Teacher Tampa Public Schools
14	Cathy Cohen	Professor of Political Science University of Chicago
15	Rebecca Burgess	Research Fellow American Enterprise Institute (<i>pending</i>)
16	Cathy Ruffing	Sr. Director Teacher P.D. Programs & Curriculum, Street Law
17	Magdalena Mieri	Director, Program in Latino History & Culture National Museum of American History, Smithsonian
18	Rosa Brooks	Professor of Law and Policy Georgetown University Law Center

Pedagogy Task Force		
1	Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg, <i>Co-chair</i>	Director CIRCLE, Tufts University
2	Kelly Leahy Whitney, <i>Co-chair</i>	Chief Product and Partnerships Officer iCivics
3	Adrienne Stang	K-12 History and Social Studies Coordinator Cambridge Public Schools
4	Mary Ellen Daneels	Lead Teacher Mentor McCormick Foundation
5	Tim Bailey	Director of Education Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History
6	Marlin Kann	Computer Science & History Teacher Cambridge Public Schools
7	Daniel Osborn	Program Director Primary Source
8	Doug Dobson	Executive Director Lou Frey Institute
9	Ilene Berson	Professor & Area Coor Early Childhood Programs, Univ of South Florida

IV. Fostering Diversity in Institutional Contexts

Our Roadmap focuses on excellence for ALL learners. Rather than structuring the work around a question of “achievement gaps” that inevitably make one group of students, typically white students, the norm against which other students should be measured, we seek to establish standards of excellence that should be the target for all learners. All learners can be measured against a shared standard of excellence, and diverse pedagogic strategies, suited to context, can be brought to bear to scaffold the development of all learners into civic participants ready to take informed and authentic action.

One feature of an excellent history and civics curriculum is that all learners should have the opportunity to see *their* story in that curriculum. This is a valuable source of motivation for participation and of the development of connection to the complex community of America’s democratic republic. A second feature of excellence in history and civics curriculum is that the experience of seeing one’s own story in the curriculum should work to foster the development of civic agency, rather than undermine it. Students from communities that have historically been marginalized—low-income minority and rural communities; sexual minorities; communities of color generally; and women in many contexts—should have the opportunity to see figures who share similar values, identities, and struggles as effective agents. And this, rather than a lesson that reinforces the idea that their identities’ key features reflect a permanent oppression or marginalization—an error that even well-intentioned curricula has made before. In addition, research has proven that the focus on civics content, promoted by the *Educating for American Democracy* team, is most effective among populations that do not benefit from access to political information in the home (Campbell, 2019).

Achieving curricula that can meet these standards of excellence (and others to be specified in the Roadmap) requires building design teams with diverse memberships. Our *Educating for American Democracy* team was intentionally designed for diversity, equity, and inclusion; recruiting leaders in content disciplines who seek excellence through integration and partnership across political and pedagogical approaches, social, economic and racial identities. Success requires that such processes be steered by those who understand how to work effectively in contexts of diversity—demographic, ideological, experiential, and professional. In our subject-area Task Forces and in the convenings led by our Steering Committee, we seek to steer the conversation in new and critically-needed directions, converting the goal of equity in the classroom into an actionable Roadmap for history and civics instruction. The balanced, comprehensive leadership and spirit of the *Educating for American Democracy* team makes it more likely that our effort can involve and engage a full range of voices, all devoted to better history and civics education.

The Steering Committee and Task Forces are also designed to reflect demographic, geographic, ideological, and professional diversity. The Task Forces are majority content-experts, the Steering Committee is majority practitioner. The leaders have extensive experience in the area of re-designing organizations and

processes for success in conditions of diversity. The Steering Committee consists of a large number of people who have driven change towards fostering diversity in institutional contexts. For just a few examples: Danielle Allen has years of experience working on diversity, including serving on (and chairing) Task Forces on diversity and organizational change at Amherst College, Princeton University, and Harvard University, as well as advising the city of London on social cohesion and connectedness in conditions of diversity; Jane Kamensky at the Schlesinger Library has focused much of her career on fostering diversity—both ideology and gender—in institutional contexts; Peter Levine has devoted much of his research to understanding diverse young American citizens and residents in relation to their civic leadership. Louise Dubé has worked with incarcerated youth and committed her career to education and justice; Adam Seagrave has built a cross-institutional network of scholars who integrate African-American political thought into the canon of American political thought.

V. Impact and Dissemination

In *Educating for American Democracy*, the central implementation goal is the dissemination of our Roadmap for Excellence in History and Civics Education (we have discussed impact and dissemination above in the discussion of implementation, and refer readers back to that section).

We propose pre- and post-convening/forum surveys to understand the participant experience and need for support. We also propose a long-term field assessment, and will make recommendations to that effect in the Roadmap, but wish to note that assessment of this type of impact can only be done after some time, through a systematic assessment of shifts and trends in key stakeholder groups to understand the cascading impact of the Roadmap. For instance: media coverage of narratives about civics and history education; mobilization of school districts to integrate our recommendations; innovation in integrated curriculum or module development by leading educators, education publishers, and nonprofits; productive blending of the two disciplines; museums using integrated language; etc.

Educating for American Democracy encompasses extensive capabilities to both deliver and disseminate, at scale, a Roadmap that will improve practice and raise educational excellence in American history and civics education for generations to come. If funded, this project can bolster our American Republic.

References

- Atwell, M.N., Bridgeland, J., and Levine, P. (2017). *Civic Deserts: America's Civic Health Challenge*. Washington D.C.: National Conference on Citizenship.
- Boss, S., Johanson, C., Arnold, S. D., Parker, W. C., Nguyen, D., Mosborg, S., Nolen, S., Valencia, S., Vye, N., & Bransford, J. (2011). The Quest for Deeper Learning and Engagement in Advanced High School Courses. *The Foundation Review*, 3(3).
- Bouygues, H.L. (2018, December 2). A New Front In The War Against Fake News: Kids. *Forbes*. Retrieved electronically August 8, 2019 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/helenleebouygues/2018/12/02/a-new-front-on-the-war-against-fake-news-kids/#23891d6bfce8>
- Brennan, J. (2017). *ESSA: Mapping opportunities for civic education*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Campbell, D.E. (2019) What social scientists have learned about civic education: A review of the literature. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94:1, 32-47.
- Campbell, D.E., Levinson, M., and Hess, F.M. (Eds.) (2012). *Making Civics Count: Citizenship Education for a New Generation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conley, D. T. (2015). A new era for educational assessment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(8).
- Desilver, D. (2018, May 21). *U.S. trails most developed countries in voter turnout*. Washington DC: Pew Research FactTank. Retrieved electronically on August 8, 2019 from <https://pewrsr.ch/2LjNokk>
- Feith, David J. (2011). Preface: Keeping the Republic. In *Teaching America: The Case for Civic Education*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Education, 14-16.
- Foa, R. S., & Mounk, Y. (2016). The Danger of Deconsolidation: The Democratic Disconnect. *Journal of Democracy*, 3, 5-17.
- Gould, J., Jamieson, K.H., Levine, P., McConnell, T., and Smith, D.B., eds. (2011). *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*. Philadelphia: Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of, 2011.

- Iyengar, S. and Westwood, S. J. (2015), Fear and Loathing Across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59: 690-707.
- Lepore, J. (2019). *This America: The Case for the Nation*. New York: Liveright.
- Levine, P. (2014). *The History of Civics and News Literacy Education*. Retrieved electronically August 2, 2019 from: <https://peterlevine.ws/?p=14272>
- Levine, P. and Kawashima-Ginsberg, K. (2017). *The Republic is (still) at risk: And civics is part of the solution*. Medford, MA: Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University. Retrieved electronically on August 8, 2019 from <https://www.civxnow.org/static/media/SummitWhitePaper.fc2a3bb5.pdf>
- Levinson, M. (2014). *No Citizen Left Behind*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mahnken, K. (2019, April 17). Can Civics Education Allow Schools to Rediscover Their Democratic Purpose — and Help Rescue America From Decline? New York: *The 74*. Retrieved electronically August 8 from: <https://www.the74million.org/article/can-civics-education-allow-schools-to-rediscover-their-democratic-purpose-and-help-rescue-america-from-decline/>
- National Assessment of Educational Process (NAEP). (2015). Interpreting NAEP Civics Results. Washington DC: National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Retrieved electronically on August 8, 2019 from <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/civics/interpreting.aspx>
- O'Connor, Sandra Day (2011). The Democratic Purpose of Education: From the Founders to Horace Mann to Today. In *Teaching America: The Case for Civic Education*, ed. David J. Feith. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Education, 19-27.
- Rebell, M. (2018). *Flunking Democracy: Schools, Courts, and Civic Participation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sawchuck, S. (2019, June 26). How 3 States Are Digging In on Civics Education. San Francisco: EdSurge. Retrieved electronically from: <https://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/how-3-states-are-digging-in-on.html>
- Singer, N. (2016, March 27). *A Supreme Court Pioneer, Now Making Her Mark on Video Games*. New York: New York Times. Retrieved electronically on August 8, 2019 from:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/28/technology/sandra-day-oconnor-supreme-court-video-games.html>